



Balmford, A., Amano, T., Bartlett, H., Chadwick, D., Collins, A., Edwards, D., Field, R., Garnsworthy, P., Green, R., Smith, P., Waters, H., Whitmore, A., Broom, DM., Chara, J., Finch, T., Garnett, E., Gathorne-Hardy, A., Hernandez-Medrano, J., Herrero, M., ... Eisner, R. (2018). The environmental costs and benefits of high-yield farming. *Nature Sustainability*, 1(9), 477–485. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0138-5>, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0265-7>

Peer reviewed version

License (if available):  
Unspecified

Link to published version (if available):  
[10.1038/s41893-018-0138-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0138-5)  
[10.1038/s41893-019-0265-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0265-7)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)  
PDF-document

This is the accepted author manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via *Nature Sustainability* at <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0138-5>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

## University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

### General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:  
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

1    **The environmental costs and benefits of high-yield farming**

2    Andrew Balmford<sup>1\*</sup>

3    Tatsuya Amano<sup>1,2</sup>

4    Harriet Bartlett<sup>1</sup>

5    Dave Chadwick<sup>3</sup>

6    Adrian Collins<sup>4</sup>

7    David Edwards<sup>5</sup>

8    Rob Field<sup>6</sup>

9    Philip Garnsworthy<sup>7</sup>

10   Rhys Green<sup>1</sup>

11   Pete Smith<sup>8</sup>

12   Helen Waters<sup>1</sup>

13   Andrew Whitmore<sup>9</sup>

14   Donald M. Broom<sup>10</sup>

15   Julian Chara<sup>11</sup>

16   Tom Finch<sup>1,6</sup>

17   Emma Garnett<sup>1</sup>

18   Alfred Gathorne-Hardy<sup>12,13,14</sup>

19 Juan Hernandez-Medrano<sup>15</sup>

20 Mario Herrero<sup>16</sup>

21 Fangyuan Hua<sup>1</sup>

22 Agnieszka Latawiec<sup>17,18</sup>

23 Tom Misselbrook<sup>4</sup>

24 Ben Phalan<sup>1,19</sup>

25 Benno I. Simmons<sup>1</sup>

26 Taro Takahashi<sup>4,20</sup>

27 James Vause<sup>21</sup>

28 Erasmus zu Ermgassen<sup>1</sup>

29 Rowan Eisner<sup>1</sup>

30

31 **1** Conservation Science Group, Department of Zoology, Downing St, Cambridge CB2 3EJ, UK

32 **2** Centre for the Study of Existential Risk, University of Cambridge, 16 Mill Lane, Cambridge CB2 1SG,

33 UK

34 **3** Environment Centre Wales, Deiniol Road, Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 2UW, UK

35 **4** Rothamsted Research, North Wyke, Okehampton EX20 2SB, UK

36 **5** Department of Animal and Plant Sciences, University of Sheffield, Western Bank, Sheffield, South

37 Yorks S10 2TN, UK

- 38 **6** RSPB Centre for Conservation Science, The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, The Lodge,  
39 Sandy, Bedfordshire SG19 2DL, UK
- 40 **7** School of Biosciences, Sutton Bonington Campus, University of Nottingham, Loughborough LE12  
41 5RD, UK
- 42 **8** Institute of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Aberdeen, 23 St Machar Drive,  
43 Aberdeen AB24 3UU, UK
- 44 **9** Rothamsted Research, Harpenden, Hertfordshire AL5 2JQ, UK
- 45 **10** Department of Veterinary Medicine, University of Cambridge, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB3  
46 0ES, UK
- 47 **11** CIPAV, Centre for Research on Sustainable Agricultural Production Systems, Carrera 25 No 6-62,  
48 Cali 760042, Colombia
- 49 **12** School of Geosciences, Crew Building, Kings Buildings, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9  
50 3JN, UK
- 51 **13** Global Academy of Agriculture and Food Security, University of Edinburgh, Easter Bush Campus,  
52 Edinburgh EH25 9RG, UK
- 53 **14** Oxford India Centre for Sustainable Development, Somerville College, Oxford OX2 6HD, UK
- 54 **15** Faculty of Veterinary Medicine and Zootechny, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Av.  
55 Universidad 3000, Col. UNAM, CU, Coyoacan, Mexico City 04510, Mexico
- 56 **16** Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, 306 Carmody Road, St Lucia, Qld  
57 4067, Australia

58    **17** Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio), Department of Geography and  
59    Environment, R. Marquês de São Vicente, 225 - Gávea, Rio de Janeiro - RJ, 22451-000, Brazil

60    **18** Institute of Agricultural Engineering and Informatics, Faculty of Production and Power  
61    Engineering, University of Agriculture in Kraków, Balicka 116B, 30-149 Kraków, Poland

62    **19** Universidade Federal da Bahia, Rua Barão de Jeremoabo, 147, Ondina, Salvador 40170-115, Bahia  
63    Brazil

64    **20** University of Bristol, British Veterinary School, Office Dolberry Building, Langford House,  
65    Langford, Bristol BS40 5DU, UK

66    **21** UN Environment World Conservation Monitoring Centre, 219 Huntingdon Road, Cambridge CB3  
67    ODL, UK

68

69    \*e-mail: [a.balmford@zoo.cam.ac.uk](mailto:a.balmford@zoo.cam.ac.uk)

70

71    **How we manage farming and food systems to meet rising demand is pivotal to the future of**  
72    **biodiversity. Extensive field data suggest impacts on wild populations would be greatly reduced**  
73    **through boosting yields on existing farmland so as to spare remaining natural habitats. High-yield**  
74    **farming raises other concerns because expressed per unit area it can generate high levels of**  
75    **externalities such as greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and nutrient losses. However, such metrics**  
76    **underestimate the overall impacts of lower-yield systems, so here we develop a framework that**  
77    **instead compares externality and land costs per unit production. Applying this to diverse datasets**  
78    **describing the externalities of four major farm sectors reveals that, rather than involving trade-**  
79    **offs, the externality and land costs of alternative production systems can co-vary positively: per**

80 unit production, land-efficient systems often produce lower externalities. For GHG emissions these  
81 associations become more strongly positive once forgone sequestration is included. Our  
82 conclusions are limited: remarkably few studies report externalities alongside yields; many  
83 important externalities and farming systems are inadequately measured; and realising the  
84 environmental benefits of high-yield systems typically requires additional measures to limit  
85 farmland expansion. Yet our results nevertheless suggest that trade-offs among key cost metrics  
86 are not as ubiquitous as sometimes perceived.

87 **The biodiversity case for high-yield farming.** Agriculture already covers around 40% of Earth's ice-  
88 and desert-free land and is responsible for around two-thirds of freshwater withdrawals<sup>1</sup>. Its  
89 immense scale means it is already the largest source of threat to other species<sup>2</sup>, so how we cope  
90 with very marked increases in demand for farm products<sup>3,4</sup> will have profound consequences for the  
91 future of global biodiversity<sup>2,5</sup>. On the demand side, cutting food waste and excessive consumption  
92 of animal products are essential<sup>1,5-8</sup>. In terms of supply, farming at high yields (production per unit  
93 area) has considerable potential to restrict humanity's impacts on biodiversity. Detailed field data  
94 from five continents and almost 1800 species from birds to daisies<sup>9-14</sup> reveals so many depend on  
95 native vegetation that for most the impacts of agriculture on their populations would be best limited  
96 by farming at high yields (production per unit area) alongside sparing large tracts of intact habitat.  
97 Provided it can be coupled with setting aside (or restoring) natural habitats<sup>15</sup>, lowering the land cost  
98 of agriculture thus appears central to addressing the extinction crisis<sup>2</sup>.

99 However, a key counterargument against this land-sparing approach is that there are many other  
100 environmental costs of agriculture besides the biodiversity displaced by the land it requires, such as  
101 greenhouse gas (GHG) and ammonia emissions, soil erosion, eutrophication, dispersal of harmful  
102 pesticides, and freshwater depletion<sup>5,7,16-18</sup>. Measured per unit area of farmland the production of  
103 such externalities is sometimes greater in high- than lower-yield farming systems<sup>17,18</sup>, potentially

weakening the case for land sparing. But while expressing externalities per unit area can help identify local-scale impacts<sup>19</sup>, it systematically underestimates the overall impact of lower-yield systems that occupy more land for the same level of production<sup>20</sup>. To be robust, assessments of externalities also need to include the off-site effects of management practices, such as crop production for supplementary feeding of livestock, or off-farm grazing for manure inputs to organic systems<sup>20–22</sup>.

**A novel framework for comparing system-wide costs.** In this paper we argue that comparisons of the overall impacts of contrasting agricultural systems should focus on the sum of externality generated per unit of production<sup>10</sup> (paralleling measures of emissions intensity in climate-change analyses). This approach has for the most part only been adopted for a relatively narrow set of agricultural products<sup>8,23</sup> and farming systems (eg organic vs conventional, glasshouse vs open-field<sup>20,24</sup>). Here we develop a more general framework, and apply it to a diversity of data on some major farm sectors, farming systems and environmental externalities. Existing data are limited but nevertheless enable us to explore the utility of this new approach, test for broad patterns, and make an informed commentary on their significance for understanding the trade-offs and co-benefits of high- vs lower-yield systems.

Our framework involves plotting the environmental costs of producing a given quantity of a commodity against one another, across alternative production systems (as in Fig. 1). We focus on examining variation in some better-known externality costs in relation to land cost (i.e. 1/yield), because of the latter's fundamental importance as a proxy for impacts on biodiversity. However, the approach could be used to explore associations among any other costs for which data are available. Comparisons must be made across production systems that could, in principle, be substituted for one another, so they must be measured or modelled identically and in the same place or, if not, potential confounding effects of different methods, climate and soils must be removed statistically.

If the idea that high-yield systems impose disproportionate externalities is true, we would expect plots of externality per unit production against land cost to show negative associations (Fig. 1a, blue symbols). However observed patterns may be more complex, and could reveal promising systems associated with low land cost and low externalities, or unpromising systems with high land and externality costs (Fig. 1b, green and red symbols respectively).

Our team of sector and externality specialists collated data for applying this framework to five major externalities (GHG emissions, water use, nitrogen [N], phosphorus [P] and soil losses) in four major sectors (Asian paddy rice, European wheat, Latin American beef, European dairy; Methods). We used both literature searches and consultation with experts to find paired yield and externality measurements for contrasting production systems in each sector. To be included, data had to be near-complete for a given externality – for example most major elements of GHG emissions or N losses had to be included, and if systems involved inputs (such as feeds or fertilisers) generated off-site we required data on the externality and land costs of their production. To limit confounding effects we narrowed our geographic scope within each sector (Supplementary Table 1), so that differences across systems could reasonably be attributed to farm practices rather than gross bioclimatic variation. Where co-products were generated we apportioned overall costs among products using economic allocation, but also investigated alternative allocation rules.

**Findings for four sectors.** Our first key result is that useable data are surprisingly scarce. Few studies measured paired externality and yield information, many reported externalities in substantially incomplete or irreconcilably divergent ways, and we could find no suitable data at all on some widely adopted practices. Nevertheless, we were able to obtain sufficient data to consider how externalities vary with land costs for nine out of 20 possible sector-externality combinations (Supplementary Table 1). The type of data available differed across these combinations (which we view as a useful test of the flexibility of our framework). For one combination the most extensive



data we could find was from a long-term experiment at a single location. However because we were interested in generalities, where possible we used information from multiple studies – either field experiments or Life Cycle Assessments (LCAs) conducted across several sites – and used Generalised Linear Mixed Models (GLMMs) to correct for confounding method and site effects (Methods). Last, for two sectors we used process-based models parameterised for a fixed set of conditions representative of the region.

The data that we were able to obtain do not suggest that environmental costs are generally larger for farming systems with low land costs (i.e. high-yield systems; Fig. 2). If anything, positive associations – in which high-yield, land-efficient systems also have lower costs in other dimensions - appear more common. For Chinese paddy rice we found sufficient multi-site experimental data to explore how two focal externalities vary with land cost across contrasting systems (Methods). GHG costs (Fig. 2a) showed negative associations with land cost across monoculture and rotational systems (assessed separately). Our GLMMs revealed that for both system types, greater application of organic N lowered land cost but increased emissions (probably because of feedstock effects on the methanogenic community<sup>25</sup>; Supplementary Table 2); in contrast there was little or no GHG penalty from boosting yield using inorganic N (arrows, Fig. 2a). A large volume of data on rice and water use showed weakly positive covariation in costs (Fig. 2b). GLMMs indicated that increasing application of inorganic N boosted yield<sup>26</sup>, and less irrigation lowered water use while incurring only a modest yield penalty<sup>27</sup> (Supplementary Table 2). Sensitivity tests of the rice analyses had little impact on these patterns (Methods; Supplementary Fig. 2).

We found two useable datasets on European wheat, both from the UK (Methods). Our GLMMs of data from a three-site experiment varying the N fertilisation regime revealed a complex relationship between GHG and land costs (Fig. 2c; Supplementary Table 2), driven by divergent responses<sup>28</sup> to adding ammonium nitrate (which lowers land costs but increases embodied GHG emissions) and

adding urea (which lowers land costs without increasing GHG emissions per unit production, but at the cost of increased ammonia volatilisation). A single-site experiment varying inorganic N treatments showed a non-linear relationship between land cost and N losses (Fig. 2d), with increasing N application lowering both costs until an apparent threshold, beyond which land cost decreased further but at the cost of greater N leaching (see also ref. 1).

In livestock systems, all data we could find showed positive covariation between land costs and externalities. For Latin American beef, we located coupled yield estimates only for GHG emissions, but here two different types of data (Methods) revealed a common pattern. Using GLMMs again to control for potentially confounding study and site effects, we found that across multiple LCAs, pasture systems with greater land demands also generated greater emissions (Fig. 2e), with both land and GHG costs reduced by pasture improvements (using N fertilization or legumes). This pattern across contrasting pasture systems was confirmed by running RUMINANT<sup>29</sup> (Fig. 2f), a process-based model which also identified relatively low land and GHG costs for a series of silvopasture and feedlot-finishing systems (for which comparable LCA data were unavailable).

For European dairy, process-based modelling of three conventional and two organic systems, parameterised for the UK, enabled us to estimate four different externalities alongside yield (Methods). This showed that conventional systems – especially those using less grazing and more concentrates – had substantially lower land and also GHG costs (Fig. 2g), in part because concentrates reduce CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from fibre digestion<sup>30</sup>. Systems with greater use of concentrates (which have less rumen-degradable protein than grass<sup>31</sup>) also showed lower losses of N, P and soil per unit production (Fig. 2h,i,j). These broad patterns persisted when we used protein production rather than economic value to allocate costs to co-products (Methods; Supplementary Fig. 2).

**Incorporating land use.** As a final analysis we examined the additional externalities resulting from the different land requirements of contrasting systems. To generate the same quantity of

agricultural product, low-yield systems require more land, allowing less to be retained or restored as natural habitat. This is in turn likely to increase GHG emissions and soil loss, and alter hydrology - though we could only find enough data to explore the first of these effects. For each sector we supplemented our direct GHG figures for each system with estimates of GHG consequences of their land use following IPCC methods<sup>32</sup> to calculate the sequestration potential of a hectare not used for farming and instead allowed to revert to climax vegetation (Methods). Results (Fig. 3) showed that these GHG opportunity costs of agriculture were typically greater than the emissions from farming activities themselves and, when added to them, in every sector generated strongly positive across-system associations between overall GHG cost and land cost. These patterns were maintained in sensitivity tests where we halved recovery rates or assumed half of the area potentially freed from farming was retained under agriculture (Methods; Supplementary Fig. 3). These findings thus confirm recent suggestions<sup>33,34</sup> that high-yield farming has the potential, provided land not needed for production is largely used for carbon sequestration, to make a substantial contribution to mitigating climate change.

**Conclusions, caveats, and knowledge gaps.** This study was conceived as an exploration of whether high-yield systems – central to the idea of sparing land for nature in the face of enormous human demand for farm products - typically impose greater negative externalities than alternative approaches. Our results support three conclusions. First, useful data are worryingly limited. We considered only four relatively well-studied sectors and a narrow set of externalities - not including important impacts such as soil health or the effects of pesticide exposure on human health<sup>20</sup>. Even then we found studies reporting yield-linked estimates of externalities scarce, with many widely adopted or promising practices within these sectors undocumented. We were not able to examine complex agricultural systems (such as mixed farming, or agroforestry) which might have relatively low externalities. Relevant data on many significant developing-world farm sectors (such as cassava

224 or dryland cereal production in Africa) also appear very limited. Given that a multi-dimensional  
225 understanding of the environmental effects of alternative production systems is integral to  
226 delivering sustainable intensification, more field measurements linking yield with a broader suite of  
227 externalities across a much wider range of practices and sectors are urgently needed.

228 Second, the available data on the sector-externality combinations we considered do not suggest that  
229 negative associations between land cost and other environmental costs of farming are typical (*cf* Fig.  
230 1a). Many low-yield systems impose high costs in other ways too and, although certain yield-  
231 improving practices have undesirable impacts (e.g. organic fertilisation of paddy rice increasing CH<sub>4</sub>  
232 emissions; see also ref. 1), other practices appear capable of reducing several costs simultaneously  
233 (see also refs 1,8,24,35,36). High (but not excessive) application of inorganic N, for example, can  
234 lower land take of Chinese rice production without incurring GHG or water-use penalties. Similarly,  
235 in Brazilian beef production adopting better pasture management, semi-intensive silvopasture and  
236 feedlot-finishing can all boost yields alongside lowering GHG emissions. It is worth noting that  
237 although most systems we examined are relatively high-yielding, other recent work suggests that  
238 positive associations (*cf* trade-offs) among environmental and land costs may if anything be more  
239 likely in lower-yielding systems<sup>1</sup>.

240 Third, pursuing promising high-yield systems is clearly not the same as encouraging business-as-  
241 usual industrial agriculture. Some high-yield practices we did not examine, such as the heavy use of  
242 pesticides in much tropical fruit cultivation<sup>37</sup>, are likely to increase externality costs per unit  
243 production. Of the high-yield practices we did investigate some, such as applying fossil-fuel-derived  
244 ammonium nitrate to UK wheat, impose disproportionately high environmental costs. Others that  
245 seem favourable in terms of our focal externalities incur other costs, such as high NH<sub>3</sub> emissions  
246 from using urea on wheat<sup>28</sup>, and management regimes that reduce costs in one geographic setting  
247 may not do so in others<sup>1</sup>. Much work characterising existing systems and designing new ones is thus

needed. We suggest our framework can serve as a device for identifying existing yield-enhancing systems which also lower other environmental costs – and perhaps more importantly, for benchmarking the environmental performance of promising new technologies and practices.

We close by stressing that for high-yield systems to generate any environmental benefits they must be coupled with efforts to reduce rebound effects. Several plausible mechanisms for limiting these by explicitly linking yield growth to improved environmental performance have been identified – including strict land-use zoning; strategic deployment of yield-enhancing loans, expertise or infrastructure; conditional access to markets; and restructured rural subsidies<sup>15</sup>. Without such linkages, systems which perform well per unit production may nevertheless cause net environmental harm through higher profits or lower prices stimulating land conversion<sup>38–40</sup>, and damage human health by encouraging overconsumption of cheap, calorie-rich but nutrient-deficient foods<sup>41,42</sup>. If promising high-yield strategies are to help solve rather than exacerbate society’s challenges, yield increases instead need to be combined with far-reaching demand-side interventions<sup>1,6,41</sup> and directly linked with effective measures to constrain agricultural expansion<sup>15</sup>.

## Methods

**Focal sectors and externalities.** We focused on 4 globally significant farm sectors (Asian paddy rice, European wheat, Latin American beef, European dairy, accounting for 90%, 33%, 23% and 53% of global output of these products<sup>43</sup>) and 5 major externalities (greenhouse gas [GHG] emissions, water use, nitrogen [N], phosphorus [P] and soil losses). We chose these sector-externality combinations because preliminary work suggested they were characterised quantitatively relatively often, using diverse approaches (single-site experiments, multi-site experiments, Life Cycle Assessments [LCAs] and process-based models), enabling us to explore the generality of our framework. We then searched the literature and consulted experts to obtain paired yield and externality estimates of alternative production systems in each sector, narrowing our geographic scope so that differences in system performance could be reasonably attributed to management practices (rather than gross variation in bioclimate or soils). Our analyses have rarely been attempted previously and have complex data requirements, so we could not adopt standard procedures developed for systematic reviews on topics where many studies have attempted to answer the same research question.

This process generated data on  $\geq 5$  contrasting production systems for 9 out of 20 possible sector-externality combinations (Supplementary Table 1): Chinese rice-GHG emissions (from multi-site experiments); Chinese rice-water use (multi-site experiments); UK wheat-GHG emissions (a multi-site experiment); UK wheat-N emissions (a single-site experiment); Brazilian beef-GHG emissions (both LCA data and process-based models); and UK dairy-GHG emissions, and N, P and soil losses (process-based models). Water use in the wheat and most of the beef systems examined was limited and so not explored further. We could not find sufficient paired yield-externality estimates for the 9 remaining sector-externality combinations.

The land and externality costs of each system were then expressed as total area used per unit production (i.e. 1/yield) and total amount of externality generated per unit production. All estimates

included the area used and externalities generated in producing externally-derived inputs (such as feed or fertilisers). For analytical tractability, as in other recent studies<sup>1,24</sup> we treat impacts occurring at different times and places as being additive. Occasional gaps in estimates for a system were filled using standard values from IPCC or other sources, or information from study authors or comparable systems (details below). Where experiments or LCAs were conducted at multiple sites, we built Generalised Linear Mixed Models (GLMMs) in the package lme4<sup>44</sup> in R version 3.3.1<sup>45</sup> to identify effects of specific management practices on land and externality cost estimates adjusted for potentially confounding biophysical and methodological effects. To illustrate the effects of statistically significant management variables (those whose 95% confidence intervals did not overlap zero; shown in bold in Supplementary Table 2) we estimated land and externality costs at the observed minimum and maximum values (for continuous management variables) or with the reference category and the category that showed the maximum effect size (for categorical variables), while keeping other variables constant; we then linked these points as arrows on our externality cost/land cost plots (Fig. 2 and Supplementary Figs. 1 and 2, with arrows displaced horizontally and/or vertically for increased visibility). Where systems generated significant co-products (wheat and rapeseed from rotational rice, beef from dairy) we allocated land and externality costs to the focal product in proportion to its relative contribution to the gross monetary value of production per unit area of farmland (from focal and co-product combined)<sup>46</sup>.

**Rice and GHG emissions.** Systematic searching of Scopus for experimental studies reporting both yields and emissions of Chinese paddy rice systems identified 17 recently published studies<sup>47–63</sup> containing 140 paired yield-emissions estimates for different systems (after within-year replicates of a system were averaged). To limit confounding effects we analysed separately the data from monoculture systems from southern provinces (2 rice crops per year; 5 studies, 60 estimates) and rotational systems from more northerly provinces (1 rice and 1 wheat or rape crop per year; 12

311 studies, 80 estimates). The studies documented the effects of variation in tillage (yes/no),  
312 application rates of inorganic and organic N, and (for rotational systems only) irrigation regime  
313 (continuous flooding vs episodic midseason drainage). There were insufficient data to examine  
314 effects of seedling density, crop variety, organic practices, biochar application, use of groundcover to  
315 lower emissions, N fertiliser type, or K or P fertilisation.

316 Land cost estimates were expressed in ha-years/tonne rice grain (i.e. the inverse of annual  
317 production per hectare farmed). GHG costs were expressed in tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>eq/tonne rice grain, and  
318 included CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions for growing and fallow seasons (with the latter where necessary  
319 based on mean values from refs 47–49,64), and embodied emissions from N fertiliser production  
320 (Yara emissions database; F. Brendrup, pers. comm.). We were unable to include emissions from  
321 producing manure or K or P fertiliser, or from farm machinery. For rotational systems we adjusted  
322 the land and GHG costs of rice production downwards by multiplying them by the proportional  
323 contribution of rice to the gross monetary value of production per unit area of farmland from rice  
324 and co-product combined (using mean post-2000 prices from ref. 43).

325 We next built GLMMs predicting variation in our estimates of land cost and GHG cost, for the  
326 monoculture and rotational datasets in turn. Management practices assessed as predictors were  
327 tillage regime (binary), application rates of organic N and of inorganic N, and irrigation regime  
328 (binary; rotational systems only). Study site was included as a random effect. For all systems we  
329 adjusted for biophysical and methodological differences across sites using the first two components  
330 from a Principal Component Analysis of site scores for 14 variables: annual precipitation,  
331 precipitation during the driest and wettest quarters, annual mean temperature, mean temperatures  
332 during the warmest and coldest quarters, maximum temperature during the warmest month, mean  
333 monthly solar radiation, latitude, longitude, soil organic carbon content, plot size, replicates per  
334 estimate, and start year (with all climate data taken from refs 65,66). PCs 1 and 2 together explained



82.3% and 76.2% of the variance in these variables for monoculture and rotational systems, respectively. Soil pH and (soil pH)<sup>2</sup> were also assessed as additional predictors. For the monoculture models tolerance values were all >0.4 (indicating an absence of multicollinearity) except for the pH terms (both <0.1), which we therefore removed. For the rotational models all tolerance values indicated an absence of multicollinearity, but (soil pH)<sup>2</sup> was removed because AICc values indicated model fit was no better than using soil pH alone. Final models (Supplementary Table 2) were then used to plot site-adjusted land and GHG costs (as points) and statistically significant management effects (as arrows) in Fig. 2a. We also tested the effect of allocating land and GHG costs in rotational systems based on the relative energy content of rice and co-products<sup>67</sup> (*cf* relative contribution to gross monetary value; Supplementary Fig. 2).

We adopted similar though simpler approaches for the next two sector-externality combinations, which again used data from multi-site experiments.

**Rice and water use.** A systematic search on Scopus yielded 15 recent studies<sup>57,58,64,68–79</sup> meeting our criteria containing 123 paired estimates describing the effects of variation in inorganic N application rate and irrigation regime on land and water costs of Chinese paddy rice. We analysed monoculture and rotational systems together but considered water use solely for periods of rice production. Land cost was expressed in ha-years/tonne rice grain, and water cost in m<sup>3</sup>/tonne rice grain (excluding rainfall). We adjusted these estimates for site effects in GLMMs of variation in land and water costs using as predictors the application rate of inorganic N, and irrigation regime (a 6-level factor: continuous flooding, continuous flooding with drainage, alternate wetting and drying, controlled irrigation, mulches or plastic films, and long periods of dry soil), while accounting for the effect of study site as a random effect. Tolerance values were all >0.7. Final models (Supplementary Table 2) were then used to plot site-adjusted land and water costs (points) and significant management effects (arrows) in Fig. 2b. Almost all sources reported data on only one rice season per year, but

one study<sup>68</sup> included separate estimates for early- and late-season rice, so we checked the robustness of our findings by re-running the analysis without the early-season data from this study (Supplementary Fig. 2).

**Wheat and GHG emissions.** The Agricultural Greenhouse Gas Inventory Research Platform<sup>80–83</sup> provided 96 paired measures of variation in yield and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in response to experimental changes in N fertiliser application rate and type. We expanded the emissions profile to include embodied emissions from N fertiliser production (from the Yara emissions database; F. Brendrup, pers. comm.). We derived land costs in ha-years/tonne wheat (at 85% dry matter) and GHG costs in tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>eq/tonne wheat. Experiments were run in 3 regions, so to adjust for site effects we built GLMMs of variation in land and GHG costs fitting study region as a random effect and using the application rates of ammonium nitrate, urea and dicyandiamide (a nitrification inhibitor) as predictors. Tolerance values were all >0.7. Adjusted land and GHG cost estimates from the final models (Supplementary Table 2) are plotted in Fig. 2c, with arrows showing statistically significant management practices.

**Wheat and N losses.** We assessed this sector-externality combination using data from Rothamsted's long-term Broadbalk wheat experiment, which investigates the effects of inorganic N application rates on yields of winter wheat. During the 1990s changes in field drainage enabled the measurement (alongside yield) of plot-specific leaching losses of nitrate<sup>84</sup>. Mean land and N costs – expressed in ha-years/tonne wheat (at 85% dry matter) and kg N leached/tonne wheat, respectively – were averaged across 8 seasons (thus smoothing-out rainfall effects), for each of 7 levels of N application (from 0–288 kg N [as ammonium nitrate] /ha-y; details in Fig. 2 legend). Results are plotted in Fig. 2d.

**Beef and GHG emissions.** Two types of data were available for this sector-externality combination, enabling us to compare findings across assessment techniques. First we examined all published LCAs

383 of Brazilian beef production<sup>85–92</sup>. Supplementing this with a bioclimatically comparable dataset from  
 384 tropical Mexico (R. Olea-Perez, pers. comm.) yielded 33 paired yield-emissions estimates for  
 385 contrasting production systems. These varied in whether they used improved pasture,  
 386 supplementary feeding, or improved breeds (which if unreported we inferred from age at first  
 387 calving, and mortality and conception rates). There were insufficient LCA data to examine the effects  
 388 of feedlots, silvopasture, or rotational grazing. Land costs were calculated in ha-years/tonne Carcass  
 389 Weight [CW], incorporating land used to grow feed, and assuming a dressing percentage of 50%<sup>93</sup>.  
 390 GHG costs were derived in tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>eq/tonne CW, including enteric CH<sub>4</sub> emissions, CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O  
 391 emissions from manure, N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from managed pasture, emissions from supplementary feed  
 392 production (where necessary using values from ref. 86), and embodied GHG emissions from N, P  
 393 and K fertiliser production. There were too few data to include CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from lime application  
 394 or farm machinery. Milk production was not a significant co-product. To control for site effects we  
 395 built GLMMs of variation in land and GHG costs using site as a random effect and use of improved  
 396 pasture, supplementary feeding and improved breeds (each a binary factor) as predictors. Tolerance  
 397 values were all >0.8. Adjusted land and GHG cost estimates from the final models (Supplementary  
 398 Table 2) are plotted in Fig. 2e, with arrows describing statistically significant management practices.  
 399 For comparison we derived an equivalent GHG cost vs land cost plot (Fig. 2f) using a process-based  
 400 model of beef production. RUMINANT<sup>29</sup> is an IPCC tier 3 digestion and metabolism model which uses  
 401 stoichiometric equations to estimate production of meat, manure N and enteric methane for any  
 402 given pasture quality, supplementary feed quantity and type, cattle breed, and region. We used  
 403 plausible combinations of these settings (Supplementary Table 3) and corresponding values of feed  
 404 and forage protein, digestibility and carbohydrate content (judged representative of the Brazilian  
 405 beef sector by MH) to derive yield and emissions estimates for 86 contrasting pasture systems. To  
 406 extend beyond the scope of the LCA analyses we also modelled 50 silvopasture systems by boosting

407 feed quality to simulate access to *Leucaena*, and 8 feedlot-finishing systems by incorporating an 83-  
 408 120 day feedlot phase when animals received high-quality mixed ration. For each system we  
 409 included the whole herd, after determining the ratio of fattening:breeding animals using the  
 410 DYNMOD demographic projection tool<sup>94</sup>, based on system-specific reproductive performance  
 411 parameters and animal growth rates (reflecting pasture quality and management; Supplementary  
 412 Table 3). Breeding animals experienced the same conditions as fattening animals (except that in  
 413 pasture and silvopasture they received no supplementary feed). Stocking rates were set to  
 414 sustainable carrying capacity for pasture and silvopasture, and 201 animals/ha for feedlots (DB pers.  
 415 obs.). Yields were converted to land cost in ha-years/tonne CW, including the area of feedlots and  
 416 land required to grow feed (using feed composition and yield data from refs 43,85). RUMINANT  
 417 emissions estimates were supplemented with estimates of manure CH<sub>4</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from  
 418 feed production, and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from pasture fertilisation (from refs 32,85). Carbon  
 419 sequestration by vegetation could not be included, so we probably overestimate net GHG emissions  
 420 from silvopasture<sup>95</sup>. All emissions were converted to CO<sub>2</sub>eq units (using conversion factors from refs  
 421 32,85 and feedlot manure distribution from ref. 96) and expressed in tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>eq/tonne CW.

422 **Dairy and four externalities.** We also used process-based models to investigate how GHG emissions  
 423 and N, P and soil losses varied with land cost across 5 dairy systems representative of UK practices  
 424 (Supplementary Table 4; Figs. 2g-j). We modelled three conventional systems with animals accessing  
 425 grazing for 270, 180 and 0 days/year, and two organic systems with grazing access for 270 and 200  
 426 days/year. Model farms were assigned rainfall and soil characteristics based on frequency  
 427 distributions of these parameters for real farms of each type, with structural and management data  
 428 (e.g. ratios of livestock categories and ages, N and P excretion rates) based on the models of refs  
 429 31,97,98. Manure management was based on representative variations of the “manure  
 430 management continuum”<sup>99</sup> (Supplementary Table 4). Physical performance data (annual milk yield,

431 concentrate feed input, replacement rate and stocking rate) were obtained from the AHDB Dairy  
 432 database (M. Topliff pers. comm.) for conventional systems and from DEFRA<sup>100</sup> for organic systems.

433 Yields were converted to land cost in ha-years/tonne Energy-Corrected Milk (ECM), including land  
 434 required to grow feed (from refs 101,102, with yield penalties for organic production from ref. 103).  
 435 Because 57% of global beef production originates from the dairy sector<sup>104</sup>, we adjusted land costs  
 436 downwards by multiplying them by the proportional contribution of milk to the gross monetary  
 437 value of production per unit area of farmland from milk and beef combined (using prices from the  
 438 AHDB Dairy database (M. Topliff pers. comm.)).

439 GHG cost estimates for each system comprised CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from enteric fermentation (based on  
 440 ref. 31), CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from manure management (following refs 32 and 105), emissions  
 441 from N fertiliser applications to pasture (from refs 106,107), and from feed production (from ref.  
 442 108). Emissions from farm machinery and buildings were not included. Emissions were then summed  
 443 and expressed in tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>eq/tonne ECM. Nitrate losses of each system were derived from the  
 444 National Environment Agricultural Pollution–Nitrate (NEAP-N) model<sup>109,110</sup>, whilst P and soil losses  
 445 were estimated using the Phosphorus and Sediment Yield CHaracterisation In Catchments (PSYCHIC)  
 446 model<sup>111,98</sup>. These last three costs were expressed in kg/tonne ECM and (as with land costs)  
 447 downscaled by allocating a portion of them to beef co-products, based on milk and beef prices.  
 448 Finally, to check the effect of this allocation rule we re-ran each analysis instead allocating costs  
 449 using the relative protein content of milk and beef (from ref. 104; Supplementary Fig. 2).

450 **GHG opportunity costs of land farmed.** Alongside the GHG emissions generated by agricultural  
 451 activities themselves (analysed above), farming typically carries an additional GHG cost. Wherever  
 452 the carbon content of farmed land is less than that of the natural habitat that could replace it if  
 453 agriculture ceased, farming imposes an opportunity cost of sequestration forgone<sup>112</sup>, whose

454 magnitude increases with the area under production (and hence with the land cost of the system).  
 455 We quantified this GHG cost using the forgone sequestration method, whereby retaining the current  
 456 land use is assumed to prevent the sequestration in soils and biomass that would occur if the land  
 457 was allowed to revert to climax vegetation (see details in Supplementary Table 5).  
 458 For each forgone transition, values for annual biomass accrual ( $\leq 20$  years) were taken from Table 4.9  
 459 of ref. 32, assuming that the climax vegetation for UK wheat and dairy was “temperate oceanic  
 460 forest (Europe)”, for Chinese rice it was “tropical moist deciduous forest (Asia, continental)”, and for  
 461 Brazilian beef it was “tropical moist deciduous forest (South America)”. The carbon content of all  
 462 biomass was assumed to be 47% of dry matter (ref. 32 Table 4.3).  
 463 Changes in soil carbon values were taken from the relevant mean percentage change in soil organic  
 464 carbon values for each land conversion from a global meta-analysis<sup>113</sup>. For UK wheat and Chinese  
 465 rice we used values for conversion of cropland to woodland; for UK dairy and Brazilian beef we used  
 466 conversion of grassland to woodland for grazing land and conversion of cropland to woodland for  
 467 land used to grow feed. Initial soil carbon values were taken from Table 2.3 of ref. 32. We assumed  
 468 the soils for UK wheat were “cold temperate, moist, high activity soils”, for Chinese rice they were  
 469 “tropical, wet, low activity soils”, for UK dairy they were “cold temperate, moist, high activity soils”  
 470 for grazing land and for producing imported feed they were “subtropical humid, LAC soils” (South  
 471 America), and for Brazilian beef for both grazing and feed production they were “tropical, moist, low  
 472 activity soils”. In each case the relevant percentage change in soil organic carbon was multiplied by  
 473 the initial soil carbon stock to calculate an absolute change, which, following IPCC guidelines<sup>32</sup>, we  
 474 assumed took 20 years.

Total annual forgone sequestration was then estimated by adding this annual change in soil organic carbon and the annual accrual of biomass carbon under reversion to climax vegetation. We assumed (as in ref. 34) that each 1ha reduction in land cost results in 1ha of recovering habitat. As above, our land cost estimates included land needed to produce externally-derived inputs, and (for rotational rice and dairy) were adjusted downwards based on the value of co-products. These GHG opportunity costs were then added to the direct GHG emissions estimates of each system, and the summed values plotted against land cost (Fig. 3).

As a sensitivity test of our key assumptions we re-ran these analyses assuming that carbon recovery rates are halved, or that (because of rebound or similar effects<sup>38–40</sup>) half of the area potentially freed from farming is retained under agriculture. These two changes to our assumptions have numerically identical effects, shown in Supplementary Fig. 3. Note that our recovery-based estimates of the GHG costs that farming imposes through land use are conservative, in that they are roughly 30-50% of those obtained from calculating GHG emissions from natural habitat clearance (annualised, for consistency with the recovery method, over 20 harvests; data not shown).

**Code availability.** The R codes used for the analyses are available from the corresponding author upon request.

**Data availability.** The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon request.

## 494    **References**

- 495    1.    Poore, J. & Nemecek, T. Reducing food's environmental impacts through producers and  
496        consumers. *Science* **360**, 987–992 (2018).
- 497    2.    Green, R. E., Cornell, S. J., Scharlemann, J. P. W. & Balmford, A. Farming and the fate of wild  
498        nature. *Science* **307**, 550–555 (2005).
- 499    3.    Tilman, D., Balzer, C., Hill, J. & Befort, B. L. Global food demand and the sustainable  
500        intensification of agriculture. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **108**, 20260–20264 (2011).
- 501    4.    Hunter, M. C., Smith, R. G., Schipanski, M. E., Atwood, L. W. & Mortensen, D. A. Agriculture in  
502        2050: recalibrating targets for sustainable intensification. *Bioscience* **67**, 386–391 (2017).
- 503    5.    Godfray, H. C. J. *et al.* Food security: the challenge of feeding 9 billion people. *Science* **327**,  
504        812–818 (2010).
- 505    6.    Bajželj, B. *et al.* Importance of food-demand management for climate mitigation. *Nat. Clim.*  
506        *Chang.* **4**, 924–929 (2014).
- 507    7.    Foley, J. A. *et al.* Solutions for a cultivated planet. *Nature* **478**, 337–342 (2011).
- 508    8.    Ripple, W. J. *et al.* Ruminants, climate change and climate policy. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* **4**, 2–5  
509        (2014).
- 510    9.    Phalan, B., Onial, M., Balmford, A. & Green, R. E. Reconciling food production and biodiversity  
511        conservation: land sharing and land sparing compared. *Science* **333**, 1289–1291 (2011).
- 512    10.    Balmford, A., Green, R. & Phalan, B. Land for food & land for nature? *Daedalus* **144**, 57–75  
513        (2015).
- 514    11.    Hulme, M. F. *et al.* Conserving the birds of Uganda's banana-coffee arc: land sparing and land



- 515 sharing compared. *PLoS One* **8**, e54597 (2013).
- 516 12. Kamp, J. *et al.* Agricultural development and the conservation of avian biodiversity on the  
517 Eurasian steppes: a comparison of land-sparing and land-sharing approaches. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **52**,  
518 1578–1587 (2015).
- 519 13. Dotta, G., Phalan, B., Silva, T. W., Green, R. & Balmford, A. Assessing strategies to reconcile  
520 agriculture and bird conservation in the temperate grasslands of South America: grasslands  
521 conservation and agriculture. *Conserv. Biol.* **30**, 618–627 (2016).
- 522 14. Williams, D. R. *et al.* Land-use strategies to balance livestock production, biodiversity  
523 conservation and carbon storage in Yucatán, Mexico. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **23**, 5260–5272  
524 (2017).
- 525 15. Phalan, B. *et al.* How can higher-yield farming help to spare nature? *Science* **351**, 450–451  
526 (2016).
- 527 16. Pretty, J. Agricultural sustainability: concepts, principles and evidence. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc.*  
528 *Lond. B. Biol. Sci.* **363**, 447–465 (2008).
- 529 17. Matson, P. A., Parton, W. J., Power, A. G. & Swift, M. J. Agricultural intensification and  
530 ecosystem properties. *Science* **277**, 504–509 (1997).
- 531 18. Tilman, D., Cassman, K. G., Matson, P. A., Naylor, R. & Polasky, S. Agricultural sustainability  
532 and intensive production practices. *Nature* **418**, 671–677 (2002).
- 533 19. Didham, R. K. *et al.* Agricultural intensification exacerbates spillover effects on soil  
534 biogeochemistry in adjacent forest remnants. *PLoS One* **10**, e0116474 (2015).
- 535 20. Seufert, V. & Ramankutty, N. Many shades of gray – the context-dependent performance of  
536 organic agriculture. *Sci. Adv.* **3**, e1602638 (2017).

- 537 21. Kirchmann, H., Bergström, L., Kätterer, T., Andrén, O. & Andersson, R. in *Organic Crop*  
538 *Production – Ambitions and Limitations* (eds. Kirchmann, H. & Bergström, L.) pp.39–72  
539 (Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 2008).
- 540 22. Madhusudan, M. D. The global village: linkages between international coffee markets and  
541 grazing by livestock in a South Indian wildlife reserve. *Conserv. Biol.* **19**, 411–420 (2005).
- 542 23. Nijdam, D., Rood, T. & Westhoek, H. The price of protein: review of land use and carbon  
543 footprints from life cycle assessments of animal food products and their substitutes. *Food*  
544 *Policy* **37**, 760–770 (2012).
- 545 24. Clark, M. & Tilman, D. Comparative analysis of environmental impacts of agricultural  
546 production systems, agricultural input efficiency, and food choice. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **12**,  
547 64016 (2017).
- 548 25. Yan, X., Yagi, K., Akiyama, H. & Akimoto, H. Statistical analysis of the major variables  
549 controlling methane emission from rice fields. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **11**, 1131–1141 (2005).
- 550 26. Pittelkow, C. M., Adviento-Borbe, M. A., van Kessel, C., Hill, J. E. & Linquist, B. A. Optimizing  
551 rice yields while minimizing yield-scaled global warming potential. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **20**,  
552 1382–1393 (2014).
- 553 27. Carrijo, D. R., Lundy, M. E. & Linquist, B. A. Rice yields and water use under alternate wetting  
554 and drying irrigation: a meta-analysis. *F. Crop. Res.* **203**, 173–180 (2017).
- 555 28. Smith, K. A. *et al.* The effect of N fertilizer forms on nitrous oxide emissions from UK arable  
556 land and grassland. *Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosystems* **93**, 127–149 (2012).
- 557 29. Herrero, M. *et al.* Biomass use, production, feed efficiencies, and greenhouse gas emissions  
558 from global livestock systems. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **110**, 20888–20893 (2013).

- 559 30. Beauchemin, K., McAllister, T. A. & McGinn, S. M. Dietary mitigation of enteric methane from  
560 cattle. *CAB Rev. Perspect. Agric. Vet. Sci. Nutr. Nat. Resour.* **4**, 1–18 (2009).
- 561 31. Wilkinson, J. M. & Garnsworthy, P. C. Dietary options to reduce the environmental impact of  
562 milk production. *J. Agric. Sci.* **155**, 334–347 (2017).
- 563 32. IPCC. *2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Prepared by the National*  
564 *Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme.* (eds. Eggleston, H. S., Buendia, L., Miwa, K., Ngara,  
565 T. & Tanabe, K.) (IGES, Hayama, 2006).
- 566 33. Gilroy, J. J. *et al.* Optimizing carbon storage and biodiversity protection in tropical agricultural  
567 landscapes. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **20**, 2162–2172 (2014).
- 568 34. Lamb, A. *et al.* The potential for land sparing to offset greenhouse gas emissions from  
569 agriculture. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* **6**, 488–492 (2016).
- 570 35. Cui, Z. *et al.* Pursuing sustainable productivity with millions of smallholder farmers. *Nature*  
571 **555**, 363–366 (2018).
- 572 36. Notarnicola, B. *et al.* The role of life cycle assessment in supporting sustainable agri-food  
573 systems: a review of the challenges. *J. Clean. Prod.* **140**, 399–409 (2017).
- 574 37. Bravo, V. *et al.* Monitoring pesticide use and associated health hazards in Central America.  
575 *Int. J. Occup. Environ. Heal. J. Int. J. Occup. Environ. Heal.* **173**, 1077–3525 (2011).
- 576 38. Lambin, E. F. & Meyfroidt, P. Global land use change, economic globalization, and the  
577 looming land scarcity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **108**, 3465–3472 (2011).
- 578 39. Ewers, R. M., Scharlemann, J. P. W., Balmford, A. & Green, R. E. Do increases in agricultural  
579 yield spare land for nature? *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **15**, 1716–1726 (2009).

- 580 40. Byerlee, D., Stevenson, J. & Villoria, N. Does intensification slow crop land expansion or  
581 encourage deforestation? *Glob. Food Sec.* **3**, 92–98 (2014).
- 582 41. Tilman, D. & Clark, M. Global diets link environmental sustainability and human health.  
583 *Nature* **515**, 518–522 (2014).
- 584 42. Yang, Q. *et al.* Added sugar intake and cardiovascular diseases mortality among US adults.  
585 *JAMA Intern. Med.* **174**, 516 (2014).
- 586

## References cited exclusively in Methods

43. FAO. *FAOSTAT: Food and Agriculture Data* <http://fao.org/faostat/> (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, 2017).
44. Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B. & Walker, S. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *J. Stat. Softw.* **67**, 1–48 (2015).
45. R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing* <https://www.r-project.org/> (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2016).
46. Guinée, J. B., Heijungs, R. & Huppes, G. Economic allocation: examples and derived decision tree. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **9**, 23–33 (2004).
47. Shang, Q. *et al.* Net annual global warming potential and greenhouse gas intensity in Chinese double rice-cropping systems: a 3-year field measurement in long-term fertilizer experiments. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **17**, 2196–2210 (2011).
48. Liu, Y. *et al.* Net global warming potential and greenhouse gas intensity from the double rice system with integrated soil–crop system management: a three-year field study. *Atmos. Environ.* **116**, 92–101 (2015).
49. Chen, Z., Chen, F., Zhang, H. & Liu, S. Effects of nitrogen application rates on net annual global warming potential and greenhouse gas intensity in double-rice cropping systems of the Southern China. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. Int.* **23**, 24781–24795 (2016).
50. Xue, J. F. *et al.* Assessment of carbon sustainability under different tillage systems in a double rice cropping system in Southern China. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **19**, 1581–1592 (2014).
51. Shen, J. *et al.* Contrasting effects of straw and straw-derived biochar amendments on greenhouse gas emissions within double rice cropping systems. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* **188**,

609 264–274 (2014).

610 52. Ma, Y. C. *et al.* Net global warming potential and greenhouse gas intensity of annual rice-  
611 wheat rotations with integrated soil-crop system management. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* **164**,  
612 209–219 (2013).

613 53. Zhang, X., Xu, X., Liu, Y., Wang, J. & Xiong, Z. Global warming potential and greenhouse gas  
614 intensity in rice agriculture driven by high yields and nitrogen use efficiency. *Biogeosciences*  
615 **13**, 2701–2714 (2016).

616 54. Yang, B. *et al.* Mitigating net global warming potential and greenhouse gas intensities by  
617 substituting chemical nitrogen fertilizers with organic fertilization strategies in rice-wheat  
618 annual rotation systems in China: a 3-year field experiment. *Ecol. Eng.* **81**, 289–297 (2015).

619 55. Zhang, Z. S., Guo, L. J., Liu, T. Q., Li, C. F. & Cao, C. G. Effects of tillage practices and straw  
620 returning methods on greenhouse gas emissions and net ecosystem economic budget in rice-  
621 wheat cropping systems in central China. *Atmos. Environ.* **122**, 636–644 (2015).

622 56. Xiong, Z. *et al.* Differences in net global warming potential and greenhouse gas intensity  
623 between major rice-based cropping systems in China. *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 17774 (2015).

624 57. Xu, Y. *et al.* Improved water management to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in no-till  
625 rapeseed–rice rotations in Central China. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* **221**, 87–98 (2016).

626 58. Xu, Y. *et al.* Effects of water-saving irrigation practices and drought resistant rice variety on  
627 greenhouse gas emissions from a no-till paddy in the central lowlands of China. *Sci. Total*  
628 *Environ.* **505**, 1043–1052 (2015).

629 59. Yao, Z. *et al.* Nitrous oxide and methane fluxes from a rice-wheat crop rotation under wheat  
630 residue incorporation and no-tillage practices. *Atmos. Environ.* **79**, 641–649 (2013).

- 631 60. Xia, L., Wang, S. & Yan, X. Effects of long-term straw incorporation on the net global warming  
632 potential and the net economic benefit in a rice-wheat cropping system in China. *Agric.*  
633 *Ecosyst. Environ.* **197**, 118–127 (2014).
- 634 61. Zhang, A. *et al.* Change in net global warming potential of a rice-wheat cropping system with  
635 biochar soil amendment in a rice paddy from China. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* **173**, 37–45  
636 (2013).
- 637 62. Zou, J., Huang, Y., Zong, L., Zheng, X. & Wang, Y. Carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide  
638 emissions from a rice-wheat rotation as affected by crop residue. *Adv. Atmos. Sci.* **21**, 691–  
639 698 (2004).
- 640 63. Zhou, M. *et al.* Nitrous oxide and methane emissions from a subtropical rice-rapeseed  
641 rotation system in China: a 3-year field case study. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* **212**, 297–309  
642 (2015).
- 643 64. Yao, Z. *et al.* Improving rice production sustainability by reducing water demand and  
644 greenhouse gas emissions with biodegradable films. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 39855 (2017).
- 645 65. Hijmans, R. J., Cameron, S. E., Parra, J. L., Jones, P. G. & Jarvis, A. *WorldClim – Global Climate*  
646 *Data: WorldClim Version 2* <http://www.worldclim.org/version2> (2017).
- 647 66. Hijmans, R. J., Cameron, S. E., Parra, J. L., Jones, P. G. & Jarvis, A. *WorldClim – Global Climate*  
648 *Data: Bioclimatic Variables* <http://www.worldclim.org/bioclim> (2017).
- 649 67. Heuzé, V., Tran, G. & Hassoun, P. *Feedipedia: Rough Rice (Paddy Rice)*  
650 <https://www.feedipedia.org/node/226> (Feedipedia, a programme by INRA, CIRAD, AFZ and  
651 FAO, 2015).
- 652 68. Liang, K. *et al.* Grain yield, water productivity and CH<sub>4</sub> emission of irrigated rice in response

653 to water management in south China. *Agric. Water Manag.* **163**, 319–331 (2016).

654 69. Kreye, C. *et al.* Fluxes of methane and nitrous oxide in water-saving rice production in north  
655 China. *Nutr. Cycl. Agroecosystems* **77**, 293–304 (2007).

656 70. Lu, W., Cheng, W., Zhang, Z., Xin, X. & Wang, X. Differences in rice water consumption and  
657 yield under four irrigation schedules in central Jilin Province, China. *Paddy Water Environ.* **14**,  
658 473–480 (2016).

659 71. Jin, X. *et al.* Water consumption and water-saving characteristics of a ground cover rice  
660 production system. *J. Hydrol.* **540**, 220–231 (2016).

661 72. Sun, H. *et al.* CH<sub>4</sub> emission in response to water-saving and drought-resistance rice (WDR)  
662 and common rice varieties under different irrigation managements. *Water, Air, Soil Pollut.*  
663 **227**, 47 (2016).

664 73. Wang, X. *et al.* The positive impacts of irrigation schedules on rice yield and water  
665 consumption: synergies in Jilin Province, Northeast China. *Int. J. Agric. Sustain.* **14**, 1–12  
666 (2016).

667 74. Xiong, Y., Peng, S., Luo, Y., Xu, J. & Yang, S. A paddy eco-ditch and wetland system to reduce  
668 non-point source pollution from rice-based production system while maintaining water use  
669 efficiency. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* **22**, 4406–4417 (2015).

670 75. Shao, G.-C. *et al.* Effects of controlled irrigation and drainage on growth, grain yield and water  
671 use in paddy rice. *Eur. J. Agron.* **53**, 1–9 (2014).

672 76. Liu, L. *et al.* Combination of site-specific nitrogen management and alternate wetting and  
673 drying irrigation increases grain yield and nitrogen and water use efficiency in super rice. *F.*  
674 *Crop. Res.* **154**, 226–235 (2013).



- 675 77. Chen, Y., Zhang, G., Xu, Y. J. & Huang, Z. Influence of irrigation water discharge frequency on  
676 soil salt removal and rice yield in a semi-arid and saline-sodic area. *Water (Switzerland)* **5**,  
677 578–592 (2013).
- 678 78. Ye, Y. *et al.* Alternate wetting and drying irrigation and controlled-release nitrogen fertilizer in  
679 late-season rice. Effects on dry matter accumulation, yield, water and nitrogen use. *F. Crop.*  
680 *Res.* **144**, 212–224 (2013).
- 681 79. Peng, S. *et al.* Integrated irrigation and drainage practices to enhance water productivity and  
682 reduce pollution in a rice production system. *Irrig. Drain.* **61**, 285–293 (2012).
- 683 80. Bell, M. J. *et al.* Nitrous oxide emissions from fertilised UK arable soils: fluxes, emission  
684 factors and mitigation. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* **212**, 134–147 (2015).
- 685 81. Bell, M. J. *et al.* *Agricultural Greenhouse Gas Inventory Research Platform - InveN2Ory:*  
686 *Fertiliser Experimental Site in East Lothian, 2011. Version:1* [dataset]  
687 <https://doi.org/10.17865/ghgno606> (Freshwater Biological Association, 2017).
- 688 82. Cardenas, L. M., Webster, C. & Donovan, N. *Agricultural Greenhouse Gas Inventory Research*  
689 *Platform - InveN2Ory: Fertiliser Experimental Site in Bedfordshire, 2011. Version:1* [dataset]  
690 <https://doi.org/10.17865/ghgno613> (Freshwater Biological Association, 2017).
- 691 83. Williams, J.R., Balshaw, H., Bhogal, A., Kingston, H., Paine, F. & Thorman, R. E. *Agricultural*  
692 *Greenhouse Gas Inventory Research Inventory Research Platform - InveN2Ory: Fertiliser*  
693 *Experimental Site in Herefordshire, 2011. Version:1* [dataset]  
694 <https://doi.org/10.17865/ghgno675> (Freshwater Biological Association, 2017).
- 695 84. Goulding, K. W. T., Poulton, P. R., Webster, C. P. & Howe, M. T. Nitrate leaching from the  
696 Broadbalk Wheat Experiment, Rothamsted, UK, as influenced by fertilizer and manure inputs

- 697 and the weather. *Soil Use Manag.* **16**, 244–250 (2000).
- 698 85. Cardoso, A. S. *et al.* Impact of the intensification of beef production in Brazil on greenhouse  
699 gas emissions and land use. *Agric. Syst.* **143**, 86–96 (2016).
- 700 86. de Figueiredo, E. B. *et al.* Greenhouse gas balance and carbon footprint of beef cattle in three  
701 contrasting pasture-management systems in Brazil. *J. Clean. Prod.* **142**, 420–431 (2017).
- 702 87. Dick, M., Abreu Da Silva, M. & Dewes, H. Life cycle assessment of beef cattle production in  
703 two typical grassland systems of southern Brazil. *J. Clean. Prod.* **96**, 426–434 (2015).
- 704 88. Florindo, T. J., de Medeiros Florindo, G. I. B., Talamini, E., da Costa, J. S. & Ruviaro, C. F.  
705 Carbon footprint and Life Cycle Costing of beef cattle in the Brazilian midwest. *J. Clean. Prod.*  
706 **147**, 119–129 (2017).
- 707 89. Mazzetto, A. M., Feigl, B. J., Schils, R. L. M., Cerri, C. E. P. & Cerri, C. C. Improved pasture and  
708 herd management to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from a Brazilian beef production  
709 system. *Livest. Sci.* **175**, 101–112 (2015).
- 710 90. Pashaei Kamali, F. *et al.* Environmental and economic performance of beef farming systems  
711 with different feeding strategies in southern Brazil. *Agric. Syst.* **146**, 70–79 (2016).
- 712 91. Ruviaro, C. F., De Léis, C. M., Lampert, V. D. N., Barcellos, J. O. J. & Dewes, H. Carbon footprint  
713 in different beef production systems on a southern Brazilian farm: a case study. *J. Clean.*  
714 *Prod.* **96**, 435–443 (2015).
- 715 92. Ruviaro, C. F. *et al.* Economic and environmental feasibility of beef production in different  
716 feed management systems in the Pampa biome, southern Brazil. *Ecol. Indic.* **60**, 930–939  
717 (2016).
- 718 93. Dick, M., Da Silva, M. A. & Dewes, H. Mitigation of environmental impacts of beef cattle

- 719 production in southern Brazil - evaluation using farm-based life cycle assessment. *J. Clean.*  
 720 *Prod.* **87**, 58–67 (2015).
- 721 94. Lesnoff, M. *DynMod: a Tool for Demographic Projections of Tropical Livestock Populations*  
 722 *Under Microsoft Excel, User's Manual - Version 1.* (CIRAD, Montpellier, Cedex; ILRI, Nairobi,  
 723 Kenya, 2008).
- 724 95. Broom, D. M., Galindo, F. A. & Murgueitio, E. Sustainable, efficient livestock production with  
 725 high biodiversity and good welfare for animals. *Proc. R. Soc. B.* **280**, 20132025 (2013).
- 726 96. Junior, C. C. *et al.* Brazilian beef cattle feedlot manure management: a country survey. *J.*  
 727 *Anim. Sci.* **91**, 1811–1818 (2013).
- 728 97. Garnsworthy, P. C. The environmental impact of fertility in dairy cows: a modelling approach  
 729 to predict methane and ammonia emissions. *Anim. Feed Sci. Technol.* **112**, 211–223 (2004).
- 730 98. Collins, A. L. & Zhang, Y. Exceedance of modern 'background' fine-grained sediment delivery  
 731 to rivers due to current agricultural land use and uptake of water pollution mitigation options  
 732 across England and Wales. *Environ. Sci. Policy* **61**, 61–73 (2016).
- 733 99. Chadwick, D. *et al.* Manure management: implications for greenhouse gas emissions. *Anim.*  
 734 *Feed Sci. Technol.* **166–167**, 514–531 (2011).
- 735 100. DEFRA. *Organic Dairy Cows: Milk Yield and Lactation Characteristics in Thirteen Established*  
 736 *Herds and Development of a Herd Simulation Model for Organic Milk Production. Project*  
 737 *Report OF0170*  
 738 [http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Com](http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=8431)  
 739 [pleted=0&ProjectID=8431](http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=8431) (DEFRA, 2000).
- 740 101. Wilkinson, J. M. Re-defining efficiency of feed use by livestock. *Animal* **5**, 1014–1022 (2011).

- 741 102. Webb, J., Audsley, E., Williams, A., Pearn, K. & Chatterton, J. Can UK livestock production be  
742 configured to maintain production while meeting targets to reduce emissions of greenhouse  
743 gases and ammonia? *J. Clean. Prod.* **83**, 204–211 (2014).
- 744 103. de Ponti, T., Rijk, B. & van Ittersum, M. K. The crop yield gap between organic and  
745 conventional agriculture. *Agric. Syst.* **108**, 1–9 (2012).
- 746 104. Gerber, P., Vellinga, T., Opio, C., Henderson, B. & Steinfeld, H. *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*  
747 *from the Dairy Sector: A Life Cycle Assessment*  
748 <http://www.fao.org/docrep/012/k7930e/k7930e00.pdf> (Food and Agriculture Organization of  
749 the United Nations, Rome, 2010).
- 750 105. Brown, K. *et al.* *UK Greenhouse Gas Inventory, 1990 to 2010: Annual Report for Submission*  
751 *under the Framework Convention on Climate Change* [https://uk-](https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/assets/documents/reports/cat07/1204251149_ukghgi-90-10_main_chapters_issue2_print_v1.pdf)  
752 [air.defra.gov.uk/assets/documents/reports/cat07/1204251149\\_ukghgi-90-](https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/assets/documents/reports/cat07/1204251149_ukghgi-90-10_main_chapters_issue2_print_v1.pdf)  
753 [10\\_main\\_chapters\\_issue2\\_print\\_v1.pdf](https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/assets/documents/reports/cat07/1204251149_ukghgi-90-10_main_chapters_issue2_print_v1.pdf) (DEFRA, 2012).
- 754 106. Misselbrook, T. H., Sutton, M. A. & Scholefield, D. A simple process-based model for  
755 estimating ammonia emissions from agricultural land after fertilizer applications. *Soil Use*  
756 *Manag.* **20**, 365–372 (2006).
- 757 107. Misselbrook, T. H., Gilhespy, S. L., Cardenas, L. M., Williams, J. & Dragosits, U. *Inventory of*  
758 *Ammonia Emissions from UK Agriculture 2015: DEFRA Contract Report (SCF0102)* [https://uk-](https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/assets/documents/reports/cat07/1702201346_nh3inv2015_Final_1_30092016.pdf)  
759 [air.defra.gov.uk/assets/documents/reports/cat07/1702201346\\_nh3inv2015\\_Final\\_1\\_300920](https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/assets/documents/reports/cat07/1702201346_nh3inv2015_Final_1_30092016.pdf)  
760 [16.pdf](https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/assets/documents/reports/cat07/1702201346_nh3inv2015_Final_1_30092016.pdf) (DEFRA, 2016).
- 761 108. Vellinga, T. V *et al.* *Methodology Used in FeedPrint: a Tool Quantifying Greenhouse Gas*  
762 *Emissions of Feed Production and Utilization, Report 674.* (Wageningen UR Livestock  
763 Research, Lelystad, The Netherlands, 2013).

- 764 109. Anthony, S., Quinn, P. & Lord, E. Catchment scale modelling of nitrate leaching. *Asp. Appl.*  
765 *Biol.* **46**, 23–32 (1996).
- 766 110. Wang, L. *et al.* The changing trend in nitrate concentrations in major aquifers due to historical  
767 nitrate loading from agricultural land across England and Wales from 1925 to 2150. *Sci. Total*  
768 *Environ.* **542**, 694–705 (2016).
- 769 111. Davison, P. S., Lord, E. I., Betson, M. J. & Strömqvist, J. PSYCHIC – A process-based model of  
770 phosphorus and sediment mobilisation and delivery within agricultural catchments. Part 1:  
771 Model description and parameterisation. *J. Hydrol.* **350**, 290–302 (2008).
- 772 112. Koponen, K. & Soimakallio, S. Foregone carbon sequestration due to land occupation - the  
773 case of agro-bioenergy in Finland. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* **20**, 1544–1556 (2015).
- 774 113. Guo, L. B. & Gifford, R. M. Soil carbon stocks and land use change: a meta analysis. *Glob.*  
775 *Chang. Biol.* **8**, 345–360 (2002).

776

777

**Acknowledgements** We are grateful for funding from the Cambridge Conservation Initiative Collaborative Fund and Arcadia, the Grantham Foundation for the Protection of the Environment, the Kenneth Miller Trust the UK-China Virtual Joint Centre for Agricultural Nitrogen (CINAg, BB/N013468/1, financed by the Newton Fund via BBSRC and NERC), BBSRC (BBS/E/C/00010330), DEVIL (NE/M021327/1), U-GRASS (NE/M016900/1), Soils-R-GRREAT (NE/P019455/1), N-Circle (BB/N013484/1), BBSRC Soil to Nutrition (S2N) strategic programme (BBS/E/C/00010330), UNAM-PAPIIT (IV200715), the Belmont Forum/FACEE-JPI (NE/M021327/1 'DEVIL'), and the Cambridge Earth System Science NERC DTP (NE/L002507/1); AB is supported by a Royal Society Wolfson Research Merit award. Rice and wheat icons made by Freepik from [www.flaticon.com](http://www.flaticon.com). We thank Frank Brendrup, Emma Caton, Achim Dobermann, Thiago Jose Florindo, Ellen Fonte, Ottoline Leyser, Andre Mazzetto, Jemima Murthwaite, Farahnaz Pashaei Kamali, Rafael Olea-Perez, Stephen Ramsden, Claudio Ruviano, Jonathan Storkey, Bernardo Strassburg, Mark Topliff, Joao Nunes Vieira da Silva, David Williams, Xiaoyuan Yan and Yusheng Zhang for advice, data or analysis, and to Kate Willott for much practical support.

**Author Contributions** AB, TA, HB, DC, DE, RF, PG, RG, PS, HW, AW and RE designed the study and performed the research, DMB, AC, JC, TF, EG, AG-H, JHM, MH, FH, AL, TM, BP, BIS, TT, JV and EzE contributed and analysed data and results, and all authors contributed substantially to the analysis and interpretation of results and writing of the manuscript.

**Author Information** The authors declare no competing financial interests. Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to AB ([apb12@cam.ac.uk](mailto:apb12@cam.ac.uk)).

## Figure Legends

**Fig. 1 | Framework for exploring how different environmental costs compare across alternative production systems.** **a**, Hypothetical plot of externality cost vs land cost of different, potentially interchangeable production systems (blue circles) in a given farming sector. In this example the data suggest a trade-off between externality and land costs across different systems. **b**, This example reveals a more complex pattern, with additional systems (in green and red circles) that are low or high in both costs.



**Fig. 2 | Externality costs of alternative production systems against land cost for five externalities in four agricultural sectors.** All costs are expressed per tonne of production (so land cost, for instance, is in ha-years/tonne – i.e. the inverse of yield). Different externalities are indicated by background shading (grey = GHG emissions, blue = water use, pink = N emissions, purple = P emissions, buff = soil loss), and different sectors (Asian paddy rice, European wheat, Latin American beef, European dairy) are shown by icons. Points on plots derived from multi-site experiments (**a**, **b**, **c**) and LCAs (**e**) show values for systems adjusted for site and study effects via GLMMs of land cost and externality cost (for 95% confidence intervals, see Supplementary Fig . 1), while arrows show management practices with statistically-significant effects (whose 95% confidence intervals do not overlap zero in the GLMMs; Methods). In **d** (wheat and N emissions), progressively darker circles depict increasing nitrate application rate (0, 48, 96, 144, 192, 240 and 288 kg N/ha-year). In **f** (beef and GHG emissions, estimated by RUMINANT), different colours show different system types. In **g-j** (dairy and four externalities), circles and squares show results for conventional and organic systems, respectively (detailed in Supplementary Table 4). Spearman's rank correlation coefficients (p-values) are **a**. rice-rice: -0.51 (0.002), rice-cereal: -0.36 (0.06), **b**. 0.19 (0.26), **c**. -0.34 (0.14), **d**. -0.21 (0.66), **e**.











824 0.95 (0.001), **f.** 0.83 (< 0.001), **g.** 0.90 (0.08), **h.** 0.70 (0.23), **i.** 1.00 (0.02) and **j.** 1.00 (0.02). Note that  
825 these correlation coefficients do not necessarily reflect non-linear relationships (e.g., **d**) accurately.

826





827 **Fig. 3 | Overall GHG cost against land cost of alternative systems in each sector, including the GHG**  
828 **opportunity costs of land under farming.** Y-axis values are the sum of GHG emissions from farming  
829 activities (plotted in Figs. 2 a, c, e, g) and the forgone sequestration potential of land maintained  
830 under farming and thus unable to revert to natural vegetation (Methods). All costs are expressed per  
831 tonne of production. Notation as in Fig. 2. Spearman's rank correlation coefficients (p-values) are **a.**  
832 rice-rice: 0.40 (0.017), rice-cereal: 0.80 (< 0.001), **b.** 0.99 (< 0.001), **c.** 0.98 (< 0.001) and **d.** 0.80  
833 (0.13).







Land cost (ha-years)




## **Supplementary information for**


### **The environmental costs and benefits of high-yield farming**

Balmford, A., T. Amano, H. Bartlett, D. Chadwick, A. Collins, D. Edwards, R. Field, P. Garnsworthy, R. Green, P. Smith, H. Waters, A. Whitmore, D.M. Broom, J. Chara, T. Finch, E. Garnett, A. Gathorne-Hardy, J. Hernandez-Medrano, M. Herrero, F. Hua , A. Latawiec, T. Misselbrook, B. Phalan, B. I. Simmons, T. Takahashi, J. Vause, E. zu Ermgassen & R. Eisner.


## Supplementary Figures



**Supplementary Figure 1. Externality costs of alternative production systems against land cost for five externalities in four agricultural sectors, showing uncertainty for statistically derived estimates.** Plots are modified versions of those in Fig. 2, with pale grey lines in **a**, **b**, **c** and **e** representing 95% confidence intervals around our GLMM-derived predictions. All other notation as in Fig. 2.



**Supplementary Figure 2. Sensitivity tests of associations between externality costs and land costs.** Plots are modified versions of those in Fig. 2. **a**, The effect in rotational paddy systems of allocating land and GHG costs between rice and co-products based on their relative contribution to production of energy (rather than of gross monetary value; Methods). **b**, The effect on the association between water cost and land cost of paddy rice of excluding early-season data from the only study reporting data for two seasons per year. **c-f**, The effects in European dairy systems of allocating land and externality costs between milk and its beef co-product in proportion to their relative contribution to production of protein per unit area of farmland (rather than of gross monetary value; Methods). Notation as in Fig. 2. Spearman's rank correlation coefficients (p-values) are **a**. rice-rice: -0.51 (0.002), rice-cereal: -0.32 (0.10), **b**. 0.17 (0.34), **c**. 0.90 (0.08), **d**. 0.60 (0.35), **e**. 0.90 (0.08) and **f**. 0.90 (0.08).



**Supplementary Figure 3. Sensitivity tests of associations between overall GHG costs (including GHG opportunity costs of land use) and land costs.** Plots are modified versions of those in Fig. 3, but show the effects of assuming either that carbon sequestration rates of recovering habitat are half those given in IPCC guidelines or that half of the area potentially freed from farming because of higher yield is retained under agriculture (Methods); these assumptions have identical effects. Notation as in Fig. 3. Spearman's rank correlation coefficients (p values) are **a.** rice-rice: 0.07 (0.69), rice-cereal: 0.66 (< 0.001), **b.** 0.97 (< 0.001), **c.** 0.98 (< 0.001) and **d.** 0.80 (0.13).

## Supplementary Tables

**Supplementary Table 1. Types of data used for investigating each sector-externality combination, and (*in italics*) combinations which were not considered important or which we were unable to assess. Cell entries also show where each sector-externality combination is plotted.**

sector externality	Asian paddy rice (China)	European wheat (UK)	Latin American beef (Brazil)	European dairy (UK)
<b>greenhouse gas emissions</b>	multi-site experiments providing 147 estimates from 17 studies (Fig. 2a)	multi-site experiments providing 96 estimates from 3 studies (Fig. 2c)	8 LCA* studies providing 33 estimates + process-based model providing 144 estimates (Fig. 2e, f)	process-based model providing 5 estimates (Fig. 2g)
<b>water use</b>	multi-site experiments providing 123 estimates from 15 studies (Fig. 2b)	<i>irrigation not widespread in UK wheat production</i>	<i>irrigation not widespread in Brazilian beef production</i>	<i>insufficient data available</i>
<b>nitrogen loss</b>	<i>insufficient data available</i>	single-site experiment providing 7 estimates (Fig. 2d)	<i>insufficient data available</i>	process-based model providing 5 estimates (Fig. 2h)
<b>phosphorus loss</b>	<i>insufficient data available</i>	<i>insufficient data available</i>	<i>insufficient data available</i>	process-based model providing 5 estimates (Fig. 2i)
<b>soil loss</b>	<i>insufficient data available</i>	<i>insufficient data available</i>	<i>insufficient data available</i>	process-based model providing 5 estimates (Fig. 2j)

\*LCA = Life Cycle Assessment



**Supplementary Table 2. Details of Generalised Linear Mixed Models for the effect of management**

**variables and covariates on land and externality costs.** Estimated coefficients are shown; those whose 95% confidence intervals (in parentheses) did not overlap zero are in bold. Tillage in Rice-GHG models represents the effect of a tillage regime (compared to a no-tillage regime). Irrigation in Rice-GHG models is for the effect of episodic midseason drainage compared to continuous flooding. The effect of irrigation in Rice-Water models is based on five levels compared to continuous flooding: continuous flooding with a drainage (CF-drain), alternative wetting and drying (AWD), controlled irrigation (CI), mulches or plastic films (F-M) and long periods of dry soil (Dry). In Beef-GHG models, improved breed represents the effect of using an improved breed relative to an unimproved breed. Cell entries also show where the results of each GLMM are plotted.

Model		Coefficients						
Rice - GHG		Inorganic N	Organic N	Tillage	PC1	PC2		
monoculture n = 60 # studies = 5  (Fig. 2a)	Land cost	<b>-1.53 × 10<sup>-3</sup></b> <b>(-2.13 × 10<sup>-3</sup>, -0.94 × 10<sup>-3</sup>)</b>	<b>-1.43 × 10<sup>-3</sup></b> <b>(-2.35 × 10<sup>-3</sup>, -0.50 × 10<sup>-3</sup>)</b>	-0.061 (-0.23, 0.11)	<b>-0.052</b> <b>(-0.071, -0.033)</b>	<b>0.038</b> <b>(0.0026, 0.074)</b>		
	Externality cost	-0.20 × 10 <sup>-3</sup> (-1.08 × 10 <sup>-3</sup> , 0.69 × 10 <sup>-3</sup> )	<b>1.76 × 10<sup>-3</sup></b> <b>(0.39 × 10<sup>-3</sup>, 3.12 × 10<sup>-3</sup>)</b>	0.19 (-0.062, 0.45)	<b>-0.12</b> <b>(-0.15, -0.092)</b>	-0.029 (-0.082, 0.023)		
		Inorganic N	Organic N	Tillage	Irrigation	Soil pH	PC1	PC2
rotational n = 80 # studies = 12  (Fig. 2a)	Land cost	<b>-1.46 × 10<sup>-3</sup></b> <b>(-1.70 × 10<sup>-3</sup>, -1.22 × 10<sup>-3</sup>)</b>	<b>-0.89 × 10<sup>-3</sup></b> <b>(-1.54 × 10<sup>-3</sup>, -0.25 × 10<sup>-3</sup>)</b>	0.023 (-0.27, 0.31)	-0.018 (-0.21, 0.18)	0.081 (-0.016, 0.18)	-0.015 (-0.062, 0.032)	-0.022 (-0.068, 0.023)
	Externality cost	1.28 × 10 <sup>-4</sup> (-3.34 × 10 <sup>-4</sup> , 5.95 × 10 <sup>-4</sup> )	<b>1.56 × 10<sup>-3</sup></b> <b>(0.32 × 10<sup>-3</sup>, 2.74 × 10<sup>-3</sup>)</b>	-0.083 (-0.65, 0.45)	<b>-0.51</b> <b>(-0.89, -0.13)</b>	0.086 (-0.038, 0.21)	<b>-0.094</b> <b>(-0.17, -0.011)</b>	0.016 (-0.047, 0.081)
rotational with energy allocation  (Supplementary Fig. 2a)	Land cost	<b>-1.45 × 10<sup>-3</sup></b> <b>(-1.69 × 10<sup>-3</sup>, -1.20 × 10<sup>-3</sup>)</b>	<b>-0.95 × 10<sup>-3</sup></b> <b>(-1.60 × 10<sup>-3</sup>, -0.30 × 10<sup>-3</sup>)</b>	-0.0084 (-0.30, 0.28)	-0.020 (-0.22, 0.17)	<b>0.11</b> <b>(0.012, 0.22)</b>	-0.037 (-0.086, 0.011)	-0.013 (-0.063, 0.034)
	Externality cost	1.62 × 10 <sup>-4</sup> (-2.62 × 10 <sup>-4</sup> , 6.13 × 10 <sup>-4</sup> )	<b>1.50 × 10<sup>-3</sup></b> <b>(0.29 × 10<sup>-3</sup>, 2.58 × 10<sup>-3</sup>)</b>	-0.14 (-0.71, 0.43)	<b>-0.52</b> <b>(-0.90, -0.17)</b>	0.11 (-0.032, 0.26)	<b>-0.11</b> <b>(-0.20, -0.028)</b>	0.032 (-0.044, 0.10)
Rice – Water		Inorganic N	Irrigation CF-drain	Irrigation AWD	Irrigation CI	Irrigation F-M	Irrigation Dry	Rainfall
n = 123 # studies = 15  (Fig. 2b)	Land cost	<b>-1.68 × 10<sup>-3</sup></b> <b>(-2.02 × 10<sup>-3</sup>, -1.33 × 10<sup>-3</sup>)</b>	0.021 (-0.056, 0.098)	-0.0076 (-0.066, 0.051)	0.088 (-0.010, 0.19)	0.041 (-0.071, 0.15)	0.066 (-0.039, 0.17)	-0.70 × 10 <sup>-4</sup> (-2.66 × 10 <sup>-4</sup> , 1.21 × 10 <sup>-4</sup> )
	Externality cost	-1.26 × 10 <sup>-3</sup> (-2.64 × 10 <sup>-3</sup> , 0.13 × 10 <sup>-3</sup> )	-0.095 (-0.41, 0.22)	<b>-0.53</b> <b>(-0.76, -0.28)</b>	<b>-0.88</b> <b>(-1.28, -0.48)</b>	<b>-1.12</b> <b>(-1.58, -0.65)</b>	<b>-1.29</b> <b>(-1.72, -0.87)</b>	<b>-1.12 × 10<sup>-3</sup></b> <b>(-1.90 × 10<sup>-3</sup>, -0.35 × 10<sup>-3</sup>)</b>
excluding three records in ref. 68	Land cost	<b>-1.67 × 10<sup>-3</sup></b> <b>(-2.02 × 10<sup>-3</sup>, -1.32 × 10<sup>-3</sup>)</b>	0.023 (-0.057, 0.10)	-0.0066 (-0.068, 0.055)	0.089 (-0.011, 0.19)	0.042 (-0.072, 0.16)	0.067 (-0.040, 0.17)	-1.02 × 10 <sup>-4</sup> (-3.94 × 10 <sup>-4</sup> , 1.87 × 10 <sup>-4</sup> )
n = 120 # studies = 15 (Supplementary Fig. 2b)	Externality cost	<b>-1.41 × 10<sup>-3</sup></b> <b>(-2.73 × 10<sup>-3</sup>, -0.068 × 10<sup>-3</sup>)</b>	-0.14 (-0.44, 0.17)	<b>-0.53</b> <b>(-0.77, -0.30)</b>	<b>-0.92</b> <b>(-1.31, -0.54)</b>	<b>-1.19</b> <b>(-1.64, -0.74)</b>	<b>-1.32</b> <b>(-1.72, -0.91)</b>	0.28 × 10 <sup>-3</sup> (-0.82 × 10 <sup>-3</sup> , 1.38 × 10 <sup>-3</sup> )
Wheat - GHG		Ammonium N rate	Urea N rate	dicyandiamide rate				
n = 96 # regions = 3  (Fig. 2c)	Land cost	<b>-4.17 × 10<sup>-3</sup></b> <b>(-4.87 × 10<sup>-3</sup>, -3.47 × 10<sup>-3</sup>)</b>	<b>-3.97 × 10<sup>-3</sup></b> <b>(-4.92 × 10<sup>-3</sup>, -3.02 × 10<sup>-3</sup>)</b>	-0.0035 (-0.011, 0.0039)				
	Externality cost	<b>1.10 × 10<sup>-3</sup></b> <b>(0.25 × 10<sup>-3</sup>, 1.94 × 10<sup>-3</sup>)</b>	-0.37 × 10 <sup>-3</sup> (-1.51 × 10 <sup>-3</sup> , 0.77 × 10 <sup>-3</sup> )	-0.0080 (-0.017, 0.00086)				

Beef – GHG (empirical)		Improved breed	Supplementary feed	Improved pasture
n = 33	Land cost	-0.41	-0.36	<b>-1.26</b>
# studies = 8		(-1.01, 0.19)	(-0.92, 0.20)	<b>(-1.81, -0.68)</b>
(Fig. 2e)	Externality cost	-0.022	-0.14	<b>-0.38</b>
		(-0.26, 0.23)	(-0.34, 0.071)	<b>(-0.57, -0.17)</b>

**Supplementary Table 3. Summary of input settings used to characterise contrasting Brazilian beef production systems in RUMINANT and DYNMOD.**

	<b>pasture systems</b>	<b>silvopasture systems</b>	<b>feedlot-finishing systems</b>
<b>forage quality</b>	very low (i.e. unimproved), low, moderate or high		high or very high
<b>feed type</b>	none, moderate quality grain or high quality grain (boosted in silvopasture systems to simulate access to <i>Leucaena</i> )		mixed ration while in feedlot, high quality grain while on pasture
<b>feed quantity (kg/animal/day)</b>	0, 0.5, 1 or 2		1.1-2.5 (over life, and adjusted in feedlot to meet target weight)
<b>cattle breed</b>	unimproved or improved	unimproved or improved	unimproved or improved
<b>replacement rate (%/year)</b>	7.5, 10 or 20	20	10 or 20
<b>age at first calving (years)</b>	3, 4 or 4.5	3	3 or 4
<b>parturition rate (%/year/reproductive female)</b>	55, 65 or 80	80	65 or 80
<b>adult mortality (%/year)</b>	2, 4 or 5	2	2 or 4
<b>juvenile mortality (%/year)</b>	5, 8 or 10	5	5 or 8

**Supplementary Table 4. Profile of the key features of our contrasting model systems of UK dairy production.**

	conventional			organic	
	C1	C2	C3	O1	O2
grazing access (days/year)	270	180	0	270	200
milk yield (Energy-Corrected Milk kg/animal-year)	5500	7800	9200	4700	6300
proportion of forage when grazing					
<i>grazed grass</i>	1	0.5	n/a	1	1
<i>grass silage</i>	0	0.5	n/a	0	0
proportion of forage when housed					
<i>grass silage</i>	1	1	0.5	1	1
<i>maize silage</i>	0	0	0.5	0	0
replacement rate (%)	31	28	33	28	30
age at first calving (months)	26	30	26	34	34
mean live weight of replacements (kg)	340	372	340	404	404
area used (ha/animal*)					
<i>grazing</i>	0.367	0.122	0.039	0.472	0.326
<i>grass silage</i>	0.130	0.268	0.182	0.201	0.381
<i>maize silage</i>	0	0	0.096	0	0
<i>concentrates</i>	0.053	0.129	0.161	0.191	0.419
<i>total</i>	0.550	0.519	0.478	0.864	1.126
N excreted (kg/animal*-year)	110	105	116	106	109
P excreted (kg/animal*-year)	15.0	17.5	18.1	14.8	17.2
manure management – housing					
<i>dairy adults</i>	slurry	slurry	slurry	straw	slurry
<i>young stock</i>	straw	straw	straw	straw	straw
<i>beef</i>	straw	straw	straw	straw	straw
manure management – hardstanding (h/day)	4	4	0	4	4
manure management – storage					
<i>dairy slurry</i>		above-ground tank, no separator farmyard manure heap		farmyard	as C1-C3
<i>beef and youngstock</i>				manure heap	as C1-C3
manure management – land spreading			50% grass trailing shoe, 50% on maize incorporated within 6h		
<i>dairy slurry</i>	trailing shoe	trailing shoe		surface	trailing shoe
<i>beef and youngstock</i>	surface	surface		surface	surface

\*an animal is an adult cow plus her replacements

**Supplementary Table 5. Sources of values used to estimate the rate of accumulation of above- and below-ground carbon when farmland recovers to natural habitat.**

<b>variable</b>	<b>value(s) used</b>	<b>source</b>
rate of recovery of above-ground biomass (tonnes dry matter/ha-year)	domain-, ecosystem- and continent-specific values	Table 4.9 in ref. 32
carbon content of biomass (tonnes C/tonne dry matter)	0.47	Table 4.3 in ref. 32
soil carbon content of natural habitat (tonnes C/ha)	climate- and soil-specific values	Table 2.3 in ref. 32
proportional change in soil carbon upon land-use transition	transition-specific values	Ref. 113